

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress  
2nd Session

Vote No. 182

June 28, 1996, 12:32 p.m.  
Page S-7257 Temp. Record

## DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION/NATO Enlargement

**SUBJECT:** National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997 . . . S. 1745. Nunn amendment No. 4367, as amended.

### ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 97-0

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, S. 1745, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997, will authorize a total of \$267.3 billion in budget authority for national defense programs (the President requested \$254.3 billion). In real terms, this bill will authorize \$5.6 billion less, and the President requested \$18.6 billion less, than was provided in fiscal year (FY) 1996.

**The Nunn amendment, as amended,** would require two separate studies to be prepared and completed by December 1, 1996 on the subject of enlarging the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). One study would be prepared by the Clinton Administration and the other would be prepared by a bipartisan review group of nongovernmental experts who would be appointed by the Majority and Minority Leaders of Congress. The studies would address the following issues:

- the geopolitical and financial costs and benefits, including financial savings, associated with the following: the enlargement of NATO; further delays in the process of NATO enlargement; and a failure to enlarge NATO;
- additional expenditures requested by prospective NATO members to facilitate their admission;
- modifications that would be needed in NATO's strategy and force structure to accommodate new members;
- the state of military preparedness and interoperability of prospective NATO members' forces;
- the relationship between NATO enlargement and transatlantic stability and security;
- the degree of democracy and free market development in prospective NATO members;
- the state of relations between prospective NATO members and their neighbors;
- the commitment of prospective NATO members to the principles of the alliance and the security of the North Atlantic area;
- the effect NATO enlargement would have on the political, economic, and security conditions of European Partnership for Peace nations not among the first new NATO members;
- the relationship between NATO enlargement and European Union enlargement;

(See other side)

YEAS (97)				NAYS (0)		NOT VOTING (3)	
Republican (51 or 100%)		Democrats (46 or 100%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans (2)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Helms	Akaka	Johnston			Hatfield- <sup>2</sup>	Bumpers- <sup>2</sup>
Ashcroft	Hutchison	Baucus	Kennedy			Inhofe- <sup>2</sup>	
Bennett	Jeffords	Biden	Kerrey				
Bond	Kassebaum	Bingaman	Kerry				
Brown	Kempthorne	Boxer	Kohl				
Burns	Kyl	Bradley	Lautenberg				
Campbell	Lott	Breaux	Leahy				
Chafee	Lugar	Bryan	Levin				
Coats	Mack	Byrd	Lieberman				
Cochran	McCain	Conrad	Mikulski				
Cohen	McConnell	Daschle	Moseley-Braun				
Coverdell	Murkowski	Dodd	Moynihan				
Craig	Nickles	Dorgan	Murray				
D'Amato	Pressler	Exon	Nunn				
DeWine	Roth	Feingold	Pell				
Domenici	Santorum	Feinstein	Pryor				
Faircloth	Shelby	Ford	Reid				
Frahm	Simpson	Glenn	Robb				
Frist	Smith	Graham	Rockefeller				
Gorton	Snowe	Harkin	Sarbanes				
Gramm	Specter	Heflin	Simon				
Grams	Stevens	Hollings	Wellstone				
Grassley	Thomas	Inouye	Wyden				
Gregg	Thompson						
Hatch	Thurmond						
	Warner						

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

- the relationship between NATO enlargement and treaties relevant to United States and European security; and
- the anticipated impact both of NATO enlargement and further delays of NATO enlargement on Russian foreign and defense policies and the costs and benefits of a security relationship between NATO and Russia.

(Prior to being amended, the Nunn amendment called only for a study by the Defense Department, and contained numerous findings on the costs, but not the benefits, of NATO enlargement, and specifically required the study to detail the expected costs, but not the benefits, of enlargement.)

**Those favoring** the amendment contended:

Argument 1:

As amended, the Nunn amendment would make certain that Congress received a truly objective report on the issues involved in enlarging NATO. Both the Clinton Administration and an independent, nonpartisan review group would prepare reports, and both reports would consider the costs and benefits associated with expanding NATO, as well as the costs and benefits of delaying a decision on expansion. As the amendment was originally drafted, it called for only a study by the President and it contained numerous findings and report instructions on the costs, but it was silent on the benefits of enlargement. Frankly, this formulation caused us great concern. We know the President's position on expanding NATO, and we feared that the report that he would issue, based on the original wording of the amendment, would be hopelessly biased and inaccurate. Now, though, with the insistence that benefits be considered as well as costs, as well as the requirement for an independent study, we are confident that this amendment would result in Congress receiving accurate, unbiased information. We are therefore pleased to vote in favor of this amendment.

Argument 2:

As the Nunn amendment was originally drafted, it did not specifically reference the possible benefits from NATO expansion, though its sponsors always intended that those benefits be considered. Also, we agree with our colleagues that it is preferable to require both the Administration and an independent group to prepare studies. Therefore, we are pleased with the changes that have been made to the Nunn amendment, and urge its adoption.

**No arguments were expressed in opposition to the amendment.**